

## REMARKS

Claims 1-3 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In an Official Action dated December 21, 2005, claims 1-3 were rejected. Applicants have amended claims herein. Applicants have canceled claims herein. Applicants have added new claims herein. Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and the subsequent interview. Examiner's comments are addressed below.

The changes of the claims are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. The claims have been amended to expedite the prosecution of the application in a manner consistent with the Patent Office Business Goals, 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (Sept. 8, 2000). In making these amendments, have not and do not narrow the scope of the protection to which Applicants consider the claimed invention to be entitled and does not concede that the subject matter of such claims was in fact disclosed or taught by the cited prior art. Rather, Applicants reserve the right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

## Interview Summary

During the interview on March 20, 2006 between Examiner and Applicants' Attorney, Dorian Cartwright, agreement was reached to enter the amendments presented herein. The participants discussed U.S. Patent No. 6,101,180 ("Donahue") in relation to independent claim 1. Applicant argued that substantive examination had not previously occurred because Donahue, which post-dates the priority date of the present application, had been cited under the benefit of Donahue's predecessor provisional patent application. However, Examiner had not provided citations to, or a copy of, the provisional application. Examiner stated that amended claims would be entered and substantively examined.

## Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(b)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-36 under 35 USC § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Donahue. This rejection is now traversed.

As amended, independent claim 1 recites a method, in a container having a state device with a plurality of types of sensor inputs, for local security state monitoring. Amended claim 1 recites a method for delivery of high-performance multimedia services including the steps of:

- assigning general content to be multicast;
- customizing the general content to suit a first area, which corresponds to a first geographical region, and thus forming a first version of the content;
- customizing the general content to suit a second area, which corresponds to a second geographical region, and thus forming a second version of the content;

multicasting, through a first head-end, the first version to an end-user system in the first area;  
*caching the first version of the content at the first head-end;*  
multicasting, through a second head-end, the second version to an end-user system in the second area;  
*caching the second version of the content at the second head-end;*  
receiving a request for the first version of the content at the first head-end from a second end-user system in the first area; and  
*providing the first version of the content from cache in response to the request.*

Advantageously, the method of claim 1 conserves network bandwidth by caching customized content for subsequent requests.

Donahue generally discloses a method for multicasting from a local Internet point of presence, content that is broadcast over a connection such as a satellite. More specifically, Donahue discloses a host that broadcasts via satellite to local node (see e.g., 10:66-11:15, and FIG. 2). From the local node, Donahue discloses multicasting the broadcast to multiple receiving computers (see 5:27-31). In addition, Donahue discloses replicating transmissions at the local node with local programming and/or advertising interspersed into the broadcast (see 5:37-41).

However, Donahue fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of amended claim 1. Fundamentally, while amended claim 1 is directed towards caching multicast content for the purpose of allowing subsequent viewing of the content, while Donahue is directed towards broadcasting, via multicasting, to a group of clients that are contemporaneously connected to receive a broadcast. Donahue merely replicates transmissions from an upstream node to a downstream node as a pass-through point. In doing so, Donahue fails to contemplate reuse of any content in order to further conserve

bandwidth between a head-end and connected end-user systems. Under the teachings of Donahue, any end-user systems that miss the broadcast times will not be able to receive content. Therefore, Donahue fails to teach or suggest either the step of caching the first content or the step of caching the second content.

Therefore, amended claim 1 is patentable over Donahue. Furthermore, independent claims 6 and 9, to the extent that they contain limitations similar to claim 1, and related dependent claims, are patentable for at least the same reasons.

In particular, new claim 4 includes an additional level of caching at the regional server. Thus, when another end-user system request content not cached at a nearest head-end, the regional server can provide the content from its cache. This further prevents burdening the network upstream from the regional server. Because Donahue completely fails to teach or suggest caching even at a first level, Donahue likewise fails to teach or suggest a second-level of caching.

### Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Date: 3/21/06

By:



Dorian Cartwright, Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 53,853  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
Silicon Valley Center  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650) 335-7247  
Fax: (650) 938-5200